

Towards A Theology of Mission

Sept 1969 1 Kinross

in ~~Handing~~ Seminar - Samuel H. Moffett, 1969.

Most ~~theologies~~ Christian theologians, with the all-important exception of that of the early church, have been self-centered, not outreaching. They have been club-minded, not mission-minded. They have been narrowly doctrinal, not evangelistic. ~~Wilhelm Pauck, a~~ ~~the historian~~ This is what Wilhelm Pauck has, at least, is a church historian's criticism of theologians. Wilhelm Pauck writes, "with the possible exception of the early church, whose theology was decisively shaped by the missionary spirit, no part of Christendom has produced major theological responsibility and creativeness in connection with evangelistic endeavors." (W. Pauck, "Theology in the life of Contemporary American Protestantism," in Religion and Culture: Essays in Honor of Paul Tillich, ed. W. Leubrecht, N.Y. Harper, 1959. p. 278, ^{quoted} in G. Anderson, The Theology of the Christian Mission, SCM, Ltd. 1961. p. 4).

It is no wonder then that ^{the history of the history} the history of theology ^{has} is ~~mostly~~ ^{concerned} with ~~concern of itself~~ ^{concern of itself} ~~club spirit~~ ^{club spirit}. ~~There must~~ ^{There must} ~~inter-relations of different viewpoints.~~ ^{inter-relations of different viewpoints.}

^{only with a} ^{always} ~~be~~ ^{be} ~~unremitting concern~~ ^{unremitting concern} ~~for the purity of the faith and the definition of truth.~~ ^{for the purity of the faith and the definition of truth.}

But unless this introspective mood is balanced by ~~an equally a more compelling~~ ^{an equally a more compelling} ~~and challenging~~ ^{and challenging} such a ~~theology~~ ^{theology} of such ~~a~~ ^a inward-turned theology ^{are} ~~is~~ ^{balanced} ~~by~~ ^{by} a challenged and enlarged by the bold thrusts of a theology that looks outward ~~not inward, to mission, not inward for diagnosis, not inward~~ ^{not inward, to mission, not inward for diagnosis, not inward}, they will ultimately be neither Biblical nor Christian. The twentieth century, like the first century, needs a Theology of mission, that looks outward for mission, not inward for diagnosis. Its concern must be not only for those already Christian, but for the whole world, which is patently not Christian.

In other words, it must be oecumenical, for the word "oecumenical" means precisely this. "pertaining to the whole inhabited world."

My thesis in today's paper is that in ^{the 20th c.} ~~our time~~ at last, ^{as in the past, just} ~~just~~ such an outward looking, ~~oecumenical~~ ^{mission-minded} ~~theory~~ is in the process of formation. ~~Its roots~~ It has come from the modern missionary movement, and its process of formation has been forged in the great oecumenical missionary conferences of the 20th c.

Once again the analogy to the development of doctrine in the early chh is striking. The ~~doctrine~~ ^{theological} creeds of the early chh were hammered out in great oecumenical councils. Any serious student of the history of ~~theology~~ knows, for example how the chh's theology of Christ grew out of a background of controversy and debate, ~~but by~~ and how the chh was led by the Spirit to work out its consensus in five great oecumenical councils. The first, Nicaea in 325 AD declared that Christ is ~~God~~ ^{divine}. The second, Constantinople in 381 agreed that Christ is also ~~Man~~ human. The third, Ephesus 431, said that X^t is one in his person. The fourth Chalcedon added that Christ is ~~two~~ in his nature - human and divine.

Is it pressing history too far to suggest that in much the same way, ^{has been} ~~but not so~~ definitively, the Spirit ~~is~~ leading the Chh ~~through~~ four great modern oecumenical councils, out of controversy and debate toward a new consensus, a vital new theology of mission for today. The four councils I will mention are Edinburgh, 1910; Jerusalem, 1928; Madras 1938, and Whitby 1947. ~~In them though they~~, I believe, Each of them has contributed in an indispensable way to a new pattern of theology of mission for our time.

I.

Attempts to formulate such a Theology of mission have in our time been only partially successful. No one viewpoint has managed to capture the mind and heart of the church since the ~~Protestant~~ 19th century Protestant consensus broke down at the turn of the century.

In essence, that consensus, ^{insofar as it touched missions,} revolved around the great evangelical doctrines of man's lostness in sin, God's great ~~plan~~ ^{redemptive plan} of salvation, and Christ's command to his ~~people~~ followers to make ~~that~~ ^{the} good news ~~known~~ ^{known} of ~~that~~ ^{that} salvation known to all. ~~The authority of the Bible was not questioned. Nor was there any doubt about the falsity and wickedness of the papal religion. It rested squarely on the unquestioned authority of the Bible, and was troubled with no doubts about the falsity and wickedness of the papal religion. To such strong and simple faith it added the emotional drive of a great strategic slogan, "The evangelization of the world in this generation"; and the - which came out of the Moody revivals by way of John R. Mott. To this ~~the~~ strong and simple faith, two important ingredients were added in the first decade of the 20th c. The first was the emotional drive of a great slogan, "The evangelization of the world in this generation", which came out of the Moody revivals through the Student Volunteer Movement for Missions, ~~into what was~~ The second was the strategic ~~plan~~ development of a world strategy for missions, begun in 1910 at the ~~first~~ Edinburgh, the first worldwide, interdenominational missionary conference. Church historians call this conference the beginning of the modern ^{the ec. movement} ecumenical movement. However ~~it~~ may be~~

criticized by some today as heretical, political & bureaucratic, it is well to remember that its roots are solidly evangelical, ^{indeed} almost revivalistic.

~~The Theology of the Edinburgh~~

Some ~~more~~ recent writers, in fact, criticize ~~Edinb~~ the theology of ~~the Edinburgh~~ that first ecumenical conference, Edinburgh 1910, as being too Biblically simplistic. Gerald Anderson, in his book The Theology of the Christian Mission, writes that "most participants seemed to take for granted that the Great Commission of Christ.. was the only basis needed for the missionary enterprise." (C.U.A. ed., London, SCM Press, 1961) ~~But this is an oversimplification a patronizing oversimplification of the Protestant evangelical Protestant consensus of that period, which was the end product of more than three hundred years of highly sophisticated ~~theological~~ developments in reformed theology~~ ^{Edinburgh's Theology of It is} ~~built~~ ^{mission was} on more than Bible prof-texts. It was the end-product of more than three hundred years of highly sophisticated reformed theology, stimulated & broadened but not diluted by ~~the~~ revival and missions.

As typical ~~as any~~ and important as any of the participants at Edinburgh was Robert E. Speer. The theology ~~of~~ of mission he carried with him to Edinburgh had been set forth in 1902 in his "Missionary Principles and Practice". In his very chapter he explicitly repudiates the very kind of theology which has been labelled typical of Edinburgh. "The last command of Christ," wrote Speer, "is often set forth as alike the primary and conclusive argument for missions... But the work of missions is our duty, not chiefly because of the command of Christ's lips, but because of the desire of his heart. He bade His Ch. to evangelize the

In Korea also, ~~the three~~

The same distinction must be made in an analysis of the theology of mission in Korea among the early missionaries. It was not fundamentalism. That came into Korea later, and was highly significant. But the pioneers were pre-fundamentalist. They belonged rather to the main stream of the Protestant evangelical concerns.

For example, the theology of mission which my father, Dr. Samuel A. Moffatt took with him to Edinburgh 1900, where he was the delegate from Korea, was ~~was~~ far more sophisticated than simple, prompt obedience to the Great Commission. In 1906 he wrote for the Chinese Recorder on "Policy & Methods for the Evangelization of Korea," and does not even mention the ~~Commission~~ ^{Great Commission until his last paragraph.} ~~last command of Christ.~~ To him the ~~theological~~ roots of mission were based on the whole broad spectrum of Christian truth, "the Divine reality of the Gospel message" — "the reality of sin... the awfulness of its punishment, the wrath of God; the reality of repentance, and the absolute remission of sin to the truly penitent, the reality of the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit, of faith in Christ as the one and only way of salvation... the conviction ^{that this Gospel is} of the power of God unto salvation and that God is able and willing to save any and all who come unto Him..." (The Chinese Recorder, May, 1906)

These are ~~theological~~ ^{theological} fundamentals, but ~~the~~ ^{19th c.} evangelical Protestantism, ~~which~~ ^{that} ~~rested~~ ^{rested} ~~on~~ ^{on} these fundamentals, was as different, ~~from~~ ^{from} the later rigid fundamentalism, as ~~Calvinism~~ ^{Calvin was different from the later} the Calvinism.

~~referred~~ who followed him.
of the Scholastics ~~was~~ different from Calvin.

~~I will suggest~~ ~~be suggesting~~, therefore, that

My first suggestion, therefore, is that any formulation of a theology of mission for our time must ^{first} look back to the abiding Biblical insights of the great evangelical consensus of the early 20th century. A theology of mission which bypasses man's sin & God's salvation and ~~the~~ ^{the finality of} ~~fact~~ Christ and the power of the Holy Spirit is no theology at all.

II. The Break down of the Consensus and the Rise of the Social Gospel.

But the consensus did not last. As any student of theology knows, ^{after Edinburgh, in 1910,} there came the time of "the shaking of the foundations," to use Paul Tillich's phrase. The Bible itself came under ~~withering~~ ^{withering} attack ~~from~~ ^{from} literary criticism, ~~from~~ ^{from} students of comparative religion. Science questioned its conclusions, literary criticism denied its unity, ~~the~~ ^{the} comparative religion threw doubt on its comparisons. The old certainties, the fundamentals, were clouded in controversy as the club split angrily into two warring camps — ¹⁷² ⁵⁴ ⁸⁸ ~~the~~ fundamentalists ^{against} ~~the~~ modernists — and the next two decades belonged to the ~~liberal~~ modernists.

In the field of theology of mission, also, the ^{stormy} years between ~~Edinburgh, 1910,~~ ~~and~~ ~~Madras 1910~~ and 1935 belonged to the liberals. These ^{social gospel} years were the years of the social gospel. ^{Annals reports major notes of there is an 88 page paper} At ~~Edinburgh~~ ^{Edinburgh} the delegate from Korea ^{one of the Korean} delegates to the second ^{General Assembly of the World Council of Churches, 1928, (vol. 89, p. 172).} spoke of ~~the~~ ^{the} gospel.

great world mission conference, Jerusalem 1928, spoke of economics and industry. ~~He~~ He asked for emphasis on moral & industrial work, for relief from Korea's economic depression, & "It is emphatically urgent," he told the Conference, "that Korean farmers be helped to make a decent living.."
 (~~The Relations Between the Young and Old Churches~~. Report of the Jerusalem Meeting of the International Mission Council, 1928, vol. III. (London: Oxford U. Press, 1928. p. 186. ~~Edinbrough's~~ ~~theology~~)

Edinbrough's theology was supremely confident of the absolute uniqueness & truth of the Christian faith. Jerusalem shocked ^{conservatives} the fundamentalists with its discovery of the values of other religions. W. E. Hocking of Harvard, a delegate, advocated "a new alignment of religious forces, a recognition of alliance with whatever is of the true substance of religion everywhere... a world religion... not detached globules.. (but a weaving) in the universal human faith in the Divine Being". (Ibid, vol. I. p. 302).

When Dr. Hocking was made chairman of a wide-ranging, highly influential Laymen's Mission Inquiry in 1931, sponsored by the ~~major whose object~~ ~~was~~ which took as its purpose a thorough re-thinking of traditional mission goals and methods, it was apparent that his "new theology" of social action & religious inclusivism had replaced Edinbrough's original consensus as the ^{de facto} dominant theology of mission. (W. E. Hocking, Rethinking Missions. N.Y. Harper & Bros. 1932).

Just as Edinbrough is ~~sometimes~~ ^{by some} dismissed as hopelessly fundamentalist, so Jerusalem's theology of mission is ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~amply~~ ^{amply} ~~denied~~ ^{denied} as others as apostate, or not even Christian. Bishop Sleyter Neill, of the World Council of Churches, ~~whom~~ ^{even so} ^{denied a Christian as}

has criticized it as possibly "the nadir of the modern missionary movement... (the moment at which liberal theology exercised its most fatal influence on missionary thinking, the lowest valley out of which ever since the missionary movement has been trying to make its way." (Stephen Neill, The Unfinished Task. Lond. Lutterworth 1957, p. 152, quoted in S.S. Tapp and A.F. James, Missions in Crisis, Chicago, Inter-Varsity Press, 1961. p. 120.

But ~~while admittedly~~ ^{but} I am more at home in Edinburgh 1960 than in Jerusalem 1928. I am not ready to write off Jerusalem as all loss. The theology of mission for our time must have its roots in Jerusalem, too, as well as in Edinburgh. Its depth ~~will~~ ^{may} come from Edinburgh's great biblical truths, ~~but there is a need~~ ^{that can} ~~to~~ ^{be} breadth ~~will~~ ^{can} come from Jerusalem's sweeping human compassion and concern.

"Our fathers were ~~concerned~~ ^{impressed with the horror that men should die} ~~but men die without Christ~~," said Jerusalem, "we are ~~equally concerned~~ ^{impressed} share that horror; we are impressed also with the horror that men should live without X^t." (Report of the Jerusalem Meeting..., op cit. p 406.) Any theology of mission that ~~separates us from~~ ^{is} ~~from service~~, that is so obsessed with life in heaven for men that it neglects man's life on earth, that separates us from service, is not adequate. In the Bible the social gospel and the evangelistic gospel belong together. The preaching and the good works belong together. Edinburgh and Jerusalem, ^{belong together.} If your theology of mission is simply preaching the gospel; and mine is simply doing good and doing justice, we are both wrong. Jesus "came preaching", and "he

went about doing good." Both emphases are in the Bible.

Any ~~Christian~~ theology of mission that in its witness has nothing to say about the hunger consuming hunger of two-thirds of the world's people is a theology neither inspired by the Christ who fed the multitudes, nor one that is calculated to win the hearts of the multitudes he died to save. ~~It is not really~~ **A** Christian witness ~~at all~~ that has no relevance to the felt needs of the world's peoples, ~~it~~ will be a witness borne in vain. Jerusalem's theology of mission, inadequate though it may have been, with its oversimplified social gospel, is nevertheless a warning that we can oversimplify the fundamentals, too. The fundamentalist may say, "This is not our problem. Our mission is to witness, not to feed." Nicholas Berdyaev answers for the whole church when he says, "Bread for myself is a physical problem, but bread for my neighbor, for everyone — is a spiritual problem." Tomorrow's theology of mission will need more than ~~so~~ evangelical doctrinal depth; it will need social ~~the~~ passion and concern.

III. Madras, 1948, and the Neo-Orthodox Reaction

Edinburgh 1910, Jerusalem 1928, Madras 1938, Whittier (1945) → Willingen (1952) "who conference" (10)
have been the most ecumenical meetings, in the true sense of the word of modern times "Theology Council Philadelphia"
in Memo. A.Y. MacKillop 1957 p 190.

the ecumenical movement's International Mission Council, which is now one of the divisions of the World Council of Churches (ibid. p. v.). The theological discussions at Madras centered around Kraemer's theology of "radical displacement" ~~of "Biblical realism"~~ ^{as Kraemer's use of the phrase is nearer to the Barthian} ~~and while the Madras statement is not quite so radical, it bears the marks of what ^{Kraemer} is called "Biblical realism."~~

Its theology of mission centers around the "Message that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself... His full revelation (is) in Jesus Christ, His Son, in the flesh... He alone is adequate for the world's need... We see & readily recognize in (non-Christian religions) ... values of deep religious experience & great moral achievements. Yet we are bold enough to call men out from them to the feet of Christ... We see glimpses of God's light in the world of religions... Yet we believe that all religious insight and experience have to be fully tested before God in Christ; and we see that this is true within as well as outside the Christian Church." (The Madras Series, Authenticity of the Faith, vol. I, pp. 184-5)

~~Today's~~ A theology of mission for today will not be quite so ^{tolerantly} ~~tolerant~~ functional as Jerusalem. ~~With Madras it will never be not but~~ Like Madras, it knows demonic disharmony in the world, and man's sin and God's judgment on false faith. But like Madras, also, it confesses that God's judgment falls ~~also~~ not only on the non-Christian systems, The Christian and the Church stand also before the judgment seat of Christ. ①

IV. ^{1949 Willingen 1952} Whittier and Theological Partnership

① Most representative theology of mission of the period was probably Edward D. Sykes's The Philosophy of the Christian World Mission (N.Y., Abingdon, Chicago 1943) which criticized Kraemer's position as "unpious without continuity" and Hooker's as "continuity with doubtful unpiousness." ~~It is a~~ ^{differs from} ~~instead~~ ^{of} ~~mediating position~~ ^{of} "unpious with continuity" (pp. 223, 225).

After Madras

~~In 1947 & 1952~~ the International Missionary Council held ~~two~~ ^{more great} ~~annual~~ ^{ecumenical} missionary conferences before its final vote ~~to merge~~ at Geneva, in 1957, to merge with the World Council of Churches. The first was at Whitby, Canada in 1947, & the second at Willingen, Germany, in 1952. The ~~great~~ emphasis at Whitby was captured by the slogan "Partnership in Mission", (Ransom, Charles W., Renewal & Advance: Christian Witness in a Revolutionary World. Whitby Meeting of the I.M.C., Addresses & Statements. Lond. Edinburgh House Press, 1948.) Willingen ~~addressed itself to~~ sought for a theological basis of this "partnership in mission" and addressed itself to the theme, "The Missionary Obligation of the Ch.": (Goodall, Norman, ed. Mission Under the Cross. The Addresses, Statements & Reports for the Meeting of the I.M.C., Willingen, Germany, July 1952. ~~Edinburgh House Press~~ ^{Lond.} Edinburgh House Press, 1953), but significantly could not agree on a theological statement of the basis of the missionary obligation. (p 238 ff.)

The mood at Whitby was expectant and confident. Once again, ~~the~~ ^{the war was over} it was felt that the world could be evangelized. ~~But~~ ^{the} younger churches had come of age. Christianity was no longer Western & limited. It was world-wide; & east & west together, could reach the world for Christ. This hopeful mood had expression in the Whitby slogan, "Partnership in ^{evangelizing} ~~Mission~~". (Ransom, Charles W. ...) which meant "Partnership in Mission".

Mission

~~Theologically~~ ~~in theology~~, ~~the new awareness of the maturity & equality~~ ~~of the younger churches led to expectations of theological independence.~~

Theologically, this emphasis on the increased role of the younger churches of Asia, Africa & Latin America led to new emphasis on theological independence ^{particularly in Asia.} Only in Asia, however, have ^{any} ^{non-Western} significant theological developments ^{contributions} been made - notably in India, China & Japan. ⁽ⁱⁿ I would add Korea, also, I ^{mean add,} but I am not bold enough to attempt any analysis of Korean Theology, any one who knows Korean theological developments far better than I.) ~~Finally~~ ^{Finally} the Asian theological journals, such as the Indian Journal of Theology (1954); the Southeast Asian Journal of Theol. (inc 1959). & the new NEASTJ (inc 1968).

~~Chinese~~

In Chinese theological circles a lively debate has raged over the propriety of any attempt to indigenize theology. ~~Chao Tz'u-shieh~~ A recent article in ~~the Occas~~ by Jonathan Tein-hu Chao, "Some Ideas on the Direction of Chinese Theological Development" (*Occasional Bulletin*, Mission Research Library, XX, No. 6, July-Aug. 1969) lists the bibliography and sketches the differing viewpoints ^{in the} ~~from the~~ radical supergroup of Wu Hwai-Ching who suggests that ~~the~~ ^{is not the} ~~idea of~~ ^{idea of} ~~others~~ ^{of others} are not to help, and religious thought from ~~to~~ ^{(2) the} ~~the~~ ^{more} moderate suggestions of theologians like Shihai Cui and Song Chuan-Seng of Tamsui Theological College that a theology of incarnation ~~can~~ ^{be} a basis for indigenization. As Jesus came to earth in human form, so the gospel can be incarnated in the Chinese context. (3) the conservative reactions of theologians like Charles Chao who resist ~~the~~ any mixing of Xty with Confucius, and simply insist ⁽⁺⁾ there will be no diff between Eastern & Western theology if both are based on the Bible. ~~Available theological writing is being to appear in such journals as the Southeast Asia Journal of Theology (since 1959), and the new Northeast Asia Journal of Theology (since 1968).~~

~~As~~ Developments in ~~indigen~~ Indian indigen theology have recently been brought to the attention of Western theologians by Henry Wagner's book, *Eastgeralten einer einheimischen Theologie in Südinchen: Ein Kapitel indischer Theologiegeschichte als kritischer Beitrag zur Definition von 'Einheimischer Theologie'*. Munich. Chr. Kaiser Verlag. 1963. ⁽²⁾ Wagner singles out three India Protestant theologians as of noteworthy significance — A. J. Appasamy, P. Chenchiah, and V. Chakkarai. It is interesting to note the connection of all three of these men with ~~the~~ ^{the} ecumenical developments ~~at~~ of the line of Edinburgh, Jerusalem and Madras. ~~Even more~~ ^{Even more} interesting is Wagner's criticism of their indigenizing attempts ~~at~~ as

① See Vinson & Hoyt W.A. "Accommodation - True and False" in *South East Asia Journal of Theology*, VIII. 3 (Jan. 1967) pp. 5-18, Heltz, Sverre, "Towards an Indigenism Theology," in *China Text*, II: 4 (1968, pp. 5-26). Cui, Shihai, "Text and Context: Kyoto Addresses at Kyoto," *Northeast Asia Journal of Theology* I: 1 (Mar. 1968, pp. 126-131), "Obedience & Theology in Asia," *South East Asia J. Th.* II. 2 (Oct. 1966, pp. 7-15)

② See review - *IRM*, LV. 218 Apr. 1966 pp. 221 ff.

unsuccessful combinations of irreconcilable elements - i.e. God's revelation - Christ, bhakti-type ^(bhava-nyaya) mysticism (in the case of Appayya), or of Christianity and yoga (in the case of Chenchiah; or of mystic bhaktism and dialectical, Biblical theology (in the case of Chakkarai).

Japanese indigenous theologies however, have attracted more attention than any other. (See C. H. Germany, Protestant Theologies in Modern Japan, Tokyo, Int. Inst. for the Study of Religions, 1965; & Carl Michaelson, Japanese Contributions to Church Theology, Phila. Westminster, 1960). They range from the Biblical evangelicalism of Tokutomi Takakura (1895-1934) who drew the old Japanese liberalism into retreat, to the dialectical theology of men like Yoshitake Kumano and Enkeichi Kan, down to recent post-war reactions against Barthianism, as in Kazo Kitamura's "theology of the pain of God," which has been called "Japan's most creative and original theology today" (Germany, op. cit. p. 204 ff.). Kitamura criticizes Barth as too dogmatically Biblical.

~~Other Japanese criticisms of the ^{Barthian} dialectic neo-orthodoxy involve~~
But the most searching ^{Japanese} criticisms of the neo-orthodox positions of Barth and Kreefter lie in the field of theology of mission. ~~Japanese attempts to make it~~
~~meaningful to Japan~~ Japanese theologians, earnestly seeking to make it relevant to Japan, resent the ~~principal~~ ^{principal} of "radical discontinuity" between faith and culture as stressed by ~~neo-orthodoxy~~ the neo-orthodoxy of Madras. Prof. Masatoshi's "Theology of meaning" (Masatoshi Doi, Imi no Shingaku, Tokyo, Nihon Kwanza Kyodan Shuppanku, 1963; & his "Introduction to a Theology of Mission," in Studies in the Church in Japan xxxiii, No. 4, March 1965, School of Theol. Doshida U., Kyoto pp. 1-5)

Its theology of mission is in its Message: "that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.. His full revelation (is) in Jesus Christ, His Son our Lord.. He alone is adequate for the world's need.. We see and readily recognize in (non-Christian religions)..values of deep religious experiences and great moral achievements. Yet we are bold enough to call men out from them to the feet of Christ.... We see glimpses of God's light in the world of religions.. Yet we believe that all religious insights and experience have to be fully tested before God in Christ; and we see that this is true within as well as outside the Christian Church.." (The Madras Series, Authority of the Faith, vol. 1, pp. 184-185)

What then do we learn from Madras? ^{We learn that} A theology of mission for the world of today cannot afford to be quite so tolerantly uncritical as Jerusalem. We live in the more realistic world of Madras, a world which knows demonic disharmony, and man's sin, and God's judgment on untruth. But like the delegates at Madras, we too confess that God's judgment falls not only on the non-Christian systems. It falls on us. The Christian and the Church ~~stand~~ must stand with all the world before the judgment seat of Christ.

Theology of Mission - 5 5 5 5 5 5

If the church's theology of mission has nothing to say about the consuming hunger of two-thirds of the world's people, about poverty, and social justice; if it has no relevance to the felt needs of the world's peoples, it is not the theology of Jesus Christ who fed the multitudes. The Christian can no longer say, "Our mission is to witness, not to feed." Nicholas Berdyaev answers for the whole church when he says, "Bread for myself is a physical problem, but bread for my neighbor, for everyone--is a spiritual problem."

Today's theology of mission will need more than evangelical, doctrinal depth. It will need social passion and concern.

First draft

7

Towards a Theology of Mission

선교신학의 형식
선교신학을 지향하여

대부분의 기독교신학은 가장 중요한 초대교회신학만을 제외하고서는 외향적인 것이 아니고 자기중심적인 것이었습니다. 기독교의 신학은 대부분이 교회에만 마음을 쏟고, 신교에는 생각이 없었습니다. 또한 기독교신학은 이론적이었으며 복음적인 것이 못되었습니다. 교회사자들은 최소한 이 점에서 신학자들을 비판하고 있습니다. Wilhelm Pauck는 다음과 같이 기술하고 있습니다. "선교정신에 의하여 그 형태가 결정되었든 초대교회의 신학을 제외하고서는 기독교세계의 어느곳에서나 선교적인 노력과 관련하여 중요한 신학적 책임성과 창의성이 표시된 일이 없습니다."

("Theology in the Life of Contemporary American Protestantism", in Religion and Culture: Essays in Honor of Paul Tillich, ed. W. Leibrecht, N. Y., Harper, 1959, p. 278; quoted in G. Anderson, The Theology of the Christian Mission, London, SCM Press, 1961, p. 4)

그러므로 신학사의 연구가 흔히 신학이론의 대결과 이단 및 교회분열을 끊임없이 분석하는데에만 관심을 기울여 왔다는 것이 전혀 이상할 것이 없습니다. 이것이 모두 그릇된 것은 아닙니다. 진리의 개념이라든가 신앙의 순수성 그리고 견해를 달리하는 기독교도간의 내적인 상호관계 등에 관하여도 부다한 관심을 기울여야 합니다. 그러나 만일 이러한 내향적인 신학이 내향성이 없이 외향적인 신학의 대담한 침투에 의하여 균형을 바로

잡거나, 도전^{challenge}을 받고 밖으로 확장되지 않는다면
 이러한 신학은 성서적인것도 될수 없고 기독교적인것도
 못할것입니다. 20세기는 제1세기와 같이 내^{inward}적인
 자기^{self-diagnosis}진단을 위한 신학이 아니고 외^{outward}향적인 선교의 신학을
 요구하고 있습니다. 그 관심은 이미 기독교인이 된 사람뿐
 아니라 비기독교적인 전세계에^{pour} 쏟아야 합니다.

그러나 이러한 신학을 구성^{formulate}하기 위한 노력은 과거에 대한
 고려^{consider}로부터 출발하지 않으면 안됩니다. 근^{modern}대의 선교
 운동이 신학이론을 가지고 있었습니까? 그 신학은 시기에
 알맞^{adequate}는 것입니까? 또 우리에게도 타^{proper}당한 것입니까?

이러한 질문에 대한 대답은 우리시대에 있어서 이러한
 선교의 신학^{formulate}을 형성하려는 모든 노력은 부분적인 성공
 만을 거두었다는 솔^{achieve}직한 고백^{frank}으로부터 시작해야 합니다.
 19세기의 개신교의 일치된 의견이 세기의 변화^{turn}에 따라
 현대주의^{magic}와, 정통과 (modernist-fundamentalist)간의
 논쟁이 비극적으로 좌절된 후부터는 어떤 하나의 특정된
 견해^{view}도 교회의 정신과 생각을 사로잡지 못하였습니다.

그 당시까지만 해도 선교와 관련하여 개신교를 지배하고
 있던 일치된 견해는 죄로 말미암은 인간상실의 위대한
 복음주의적 교리와 그리스도의 죽음과 부활에 의한 하나님의
 구원의^{plan} 경로 그리고 구원의 기쁜 소식을 전세계에 알리라는
 제자들에게 대한 그리스도의 마지막 분부^{command}등이 중심으로
 생각되어 왔습니다. 이는 의심할 여지가 없는 성서의
 권위^{authority}에 정면^{squarely}으로 기초하고 일치된 의견이었으며, 이교도의^{pagan religion}

3
기만성^{falsity}과 부당성^{inadequacy}에 관하여는 틀림없이 파문을 던졌습니다. ^{with no doubts} ^{give trouble}

19세기에서 20세기로 접어들어^{pass into} 음에 따라 이러한 단순^{simple}하고도 강력^{strong}한 신학적^{theological} 기초^{base}에 두가지의 중요한 요소^{ingredients}가 추가^{add}되었습니다. 그 하나는 "이 세대에서 세계를 복음화하자"는 구호^{slogan}를 제창^{shout}하는 감성^{emotional}적인 운동이었습니다. 이 구호는 학생자치선교운동 (Student Volunteer Movement for Missions)을 통한 Moody 부흥^{revival}으로부터 나온 것입니다. 두번째는 세계선교전략^{world-mission strategy}의 발전^{development}으로 이는 최초의 세계적^{global}인 선교와 선교회의^{mission conference}이라 할 수 있는 1910년의 Edinburgh 회의^{conference}에서 시작^{beginning}되었습니다. 교회사학자^{church historian}들은 이 회의를 근대 ecumenical 운동의 효시^{beginning}라고 부릅니다. 그리고 이 ecumenical 운동의 초기^{early}기원이 강력한 복음주의적^{evangelical} 그리고 거의 고대적^{ancient}인 형태로 발생^{shape}하였다는 점에 유의^{note}하면 매우 흥미^{interesting}있는 일이기도 합니다.

사실상 최근^{recent}의 학자^{scholar}들에는 1910년 Edinburgh에서 열렸^{held}은 최초의 ecumenical 회의의 신학이 지나치게 심서적으로 단순^{simple}하였다고 비판^{critic}하는 학자도 있습니다. Gerald Anderson은 그의 저서 기독교선교의 신학 (The Theology of the Christian Mission)에서 "(Edinburgh 회의의) 대부분의 참석자^{participants}들은 그리스도의 대부분만이 선교사업에 필요하고 유일한 기초^{base}로서 당연하게 생각한 듯 하다"고 기술^{state}하였습니다 (London, SCM, 1961, p. 9). 지난세기의 복음주의적^{evangelical} 개신교의 견해^{view}를 이와 같이 모관^{patronizing}한 태도로 지나치게 단순화^{simplify}하는 것이 오늘날의 보편적^{popular} 경향^{trend}입니다. 이는 정확^{accurate}한 방법은 아닙니다. 이러한 오해는 최근의 학자^{scholar}들이

가리시게 된것은 세계가 복음화되어야 할 필요가 있음을
 잘 아셨기 때문이다. 이 문제에 관한 우리의 사명은
^{primarily} 제일차적으로 그리스도의 ^{deeds} 명령에 의하여 결정되는것이
 아니고 ^{foundation} 생의 기초가 되는 ^{life} 삶의 ^{truth} 진실성과 ^{conditions} 정황에 따라
 결정되는 것이다. . . . 그러므로 ^{essential} 선교사업에 있어서의 필수
^{thing} 요건은 그리스도의 마지막 ^{command} 분부를 ^{repeat} 반복하고 '이것이
 교회의 ^{marching orders} 행군 명령이며 교회의 ^{sent} 복적이다' 하며 그리스도의
 명령을 ^{sincerely} 성실하게 ^{affirm} 재확인하는것이 아니다." 그는 계속하여
 선교의 ^{real} 참된 ^{root} 근거는 "선교가 기독교신앙에서 차지하는
^{fundamental place} 기본적인 위치"에 놓여 있으며 "그리스도정신의 필수적인
^{principle} 원리에 대한 ^{warm} 마음속으로부터의 ^{response} 뜨거운 응답에 뿌리를
 두고 있다고 기술하였습니다 (R. E. Speer, Missionary
 Principles and Practice, N. Y., Revell, 1902, pp. 9-11,
 italics mine). 이러한 언명은 ^{statement} 놀라울만큼 ^{remarkably} 현실적이고
^{modern} 근대적인듯한 ^{impression} 인상을 주며 ^{simplicity} 소박성을 완전히 ^{validate} 내역하고
 있습니다.

이와 마찬가지로 한국에 나왔던 ^{early missionary} 초기선교사의 선교신학의
^{analyses} 분석에 있어서도 ^{view} 복음주의적인 선해와 ^{simplicity} 정통주의적인 소박성
^{between clear distinction} 사이의 ^{clear} 화연한 구분을 하여야 합니다. 그들의 신학은
 정통주의는 아니었습니다. 정통주의가 한국에 들어온것은
^{after} 그 이후이었으며, 이 정통주의는 매우 커다란 ^{view} 영향력을 가지고
 있었습니다. 그러나 초기 선교의 ^{pioneer} 개척자들은 정통주의
 이전 (pre-fundamentalist) 에 ^{delong} 속하고 ^{view} 있었습니다. 오히려
 그들은 그들이 자라난 개신교의 ^{main stream} 주요사조인 ^{evangelical} 복음주의의
^{view} 선해를 더르고 있었습니다.

In example theology | 예를 들면 1910년의 Edinburgh 회의에 한국대표로
 of mission with S.A. Moffett | 참석하였던 저의 선친 Samuel A. Moffett의 선교신학만
 took to Edinburgh | 하여도 결코 그리스도의 마지막 분부에 대한 단순하고
 과파서적인 맹종은 아니었습니다. 그 분이 1906년
 Chinese Recorder란 책에 "한국의 복음화를 위한
 정책과 방법" (Policy and Methods for the Evan-
 gelization of Korea)이라는 글을 썼는데 그
 마지막 구절까지 그리스도의 마지막 분부에 관하여는
 전혀 언급이 없습니다. 그에게 있어서 선교의 신학적인
 기초는 광범위한 기독교 진리의 ^{spectrum}영상 전체에 ^{whole}걸친 것이었-
 습니다. 즉 "복음의 신성한 실체성" "죄의 실존과 저기에
 대한 끔찍한 응보" 즉 ^{penitent}하나님의 진노, 회개의 ^{reality}현실성과
 진정으로 참회하는 자에 대한 ^{only}죄의 절대적인 용서, 저들에게
 하는 성령의 역사, 구원의 유일한 방법으로서의 그리스도에
 대한 신앙... 복음은 하나님의 구원의 능력이며,
 하나님은 당신에게로 나오는 모든 사람을 구원하실
 수 있으며 ^{willing to save}또 구원코저 하신다는 ^{undeniable}확신" 등이
 "복음화 사업의 ^{work of evangelization}밑받침이 되고 있으며, 또 그 생명력을
 불러 일으키는 ^{awaken}기본 원리이고 ^{basic principle}기본 신앙"이라고 그는
 피력하였습니다 (S A Moffett, in The Chinese Re-
 corder, May, 1906)

These two are "fundamentals," 이것들은 물론 어느 정도에 있어서는 정통주의의 "기초"
 but 19th c evangelists as (fundamentals)이기도 합니다. 이는 마치
 diff. from later fundamentalists Calvin이 Calvin을 추종한 학자들의 Calvin주의와
 as Calvin from later 칼렸든 것처럼 19세기의 복음주의적 개신교도 이 ^{later}사실은
 scholastic Calvinists. 정열과 확신으로 입증하였다는 점에서, 후기의 ^{ripied}완고한

분열되었습니다. 그리고 ^{at least} 최소한 20년간 ^{are} 신학사조는 보수주의적^{conservative}인 것이 아니고 자유주의적^{liberals}인 방향으로 ^{direction} 흘러갈 듯이 보였습니다.

Contrast between Edinb 1910,

Jerusalem 1928

1910년 Edinburgh 에서 열렸던 제1차 선교회의와 1928년 Jerusalem 에서 열렸던 제2차 세계선교대회 사이의 ^{contrast} 대조적^{basic}인 차이는 ^{difference} 지배적^{prevailing}인 선교신학의 ^{emphasis} 강조점이 근본적으로 ^{shift} 변천하였다는 데에 있습니다. Edinburgh 회의의 신학적인 화선은 자취를 ^{disappear} 감추었습니다. Jerusalem 대회에 ^{join in} 참석하였던 성공회의 한 감독은 다음과 같이 ^{boldly} 비판적인 ^{write} 글을 ^{wrote} 라고 있습니다. "과거에 흔히 '신학'(theology) 이라고 하던 것은 회람어의 '하나님에 관하여 생각하는 것'(thinking about God)의 의미를 가지고 있었으나, ^{popularity} 별로 인기가 없었으며, 이제 ^{ourselves}는 그대신 ^{we} 우리 자신의 미묘한 감정에 관하여 생각하는 '종교철학'(philosophy of religion)이 나타나게 되었으며 이것이 ^{very} 매우 커다란 ^{popularity} 인기를 차지하게 되었다." (The Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council, N.Y. IMC, 1928, Vol. 1, P. 809) 고 말했습니다.

Edinb. emphasized impulse;

Jer. disc. the social gospel.

Edinburgh 회의에서는 ^{witness} 선교적인 증거와 ^{전도사업} [복음주의를] 강조하였습니다. 그러나 Jerusalem 대회에서는 사회적 복음을 ^{harvest} 깨닫게 되었습니다. Edinburgh 회의에서 한국은 복음주의적 ^{field white} 열실^{present}에 있어서 ^{major} 전방면으로 ^{practice} 표시되어 있었습니다. ^{그러나} Jerusalem 회의 보고서 중 한국관계의 주요정보는 "한국의 농촌과, 그 경제, 사회적, 및 ^{전도} 전도뿐 아니라

종교적 조건에 관한 예비조사 "라는 ~~88 페이지~~ ^{condition} ^{professional} ^{sociological} ^{preliminary} ^가 ^{contain} ^{9.}
 달리는 전문적인 사회학적인 조사서 ^가 수록되어 있습니다.
 (Ibid. vol. 6, p.p. 84-172). Edinburgh 회의에서
 한국대표는 복음주의와 복음이 관하여 말하였습니다.
 Jerusalem 회의에서 한국대표의 한 사람인 Hugh Cynn^{신홍우}은
 경제와 산업에 관하여 ^{industry} ^{spoke} 언명하였습니다. 그는 한국의
 경제적인 불평등을 구제하기 위하여 ^{depression} ^{relief} 농촌사업과 ^{industrial work} 기술사업에
^{emphasis} 중점을 두도록 ^{farmings} ^{decent living} 요청하였습니다. 동회의에서 그는
 "한국의 농민이 ^{urgent} 상당한 생활을 하도록 도와주는 것이
 급선무..."라고 말하였습니다. (Ibid. vol. 3, p. 186)

But much more shocking to
 me than social gospel
 was Tomcious tolerance of other
 religions.

그러나 Edinburgh 선교전통을 따르는 ^{tradition} ^{follow} 복음주의자들에게
 있어서 ^{social} ^{gospel} 사회주의적 복음보다 ^{other religion} 한층 더 놀라운 것은 타종교에
 대한 Jerusalem 대회의 ^{tolerant attitude} 관대한 태도이었던 바 이러한
 관용성은 ^{syncretism} 제설 혼합주의 (syncretism)에 ^{border} 접근하는 것이었습니다.
 Wm H Hocking은 "종교개혁의 ^{religious forces} 새로운 정열, 세계 어느
 곳에서나 ^{true substance} 종교의 참된 본체를 ^{alienation} 갖출 종교와의 동맹 제휴 승인,
 세계종교, 분리된 ^{detached} "같은 ^{voluntas} "같이" 아니라 ^{universal} 하나됨 안에서 보편적인
 인간의 신앙으로 ^{merging} 융화되는 세계종교" 등을 ^{persuade} 설득하였습니다.
 (Ibid. vol. 1, p 302). Jerusalem 선교대회후
 Hocking 박사가 ^{additional} 전통적인 ^{presupposition} 선교모범의 ^{radical} 전제조건을
^{thorough} 철저하게 ^{re-thinking} 재고할 것을 목적으로 ^{goal} ^{wide-ranging} 광범위하게 커다란
 영향력을 가진 평신도 선교연구회 (Laymen's Missionary
 Inquiry) 회장으로 취임하자 ^{social action} 사회활동의 "새로운 신학"
 (new theology) 과 ^{religious} ^{inclusive} 종교적인 포괄주의가 Edinburgh 회의의
 복음주의적 ^{new} 전태에 ^{replaced} 대치하여 ^{dominant} 개신교의 지배적인 선교신학이
 되었습니다. (See W. E Hocking, Rethinking Missions, N.Y.,

Harper & Bros., 1932)

Perhaps pendulum had swung too far from Edinburgh.

아미도, Edinburgh로부터의 ^{pendulum swing too far} 움직임은 너무 멀어져 간듯 합니다. ^{the liberal} 만일 자유주의자들에게 Edinburgh의 사조가 너무 ^{thought} 정통주의적으로 나타났다면 ^{criticize} 이제는 새로운 신신학자/자신들이 ^{turn} 반박을 받을 차례가 되었습니다. Hocking도 정도가 너무 지나쳤습니다. 그리하여 ecumenical 신학자인 WCC의 Stephen Neill ^{modern} 감독까지도 Jerusalem 대회를 "근대선교운동의 ^{reader} 최하점이며 자유주의 신학이 선교사상에 ^{patal} 가장 ^{exercise moment} 숙명적인 영향을 행사한 계기이며, 선교운동이 그 진로를 ^{make one's way} 찾아 나아가기 시작하는 ^{lowest valley} 깊은 골짜기"라고 비판하였습니다 (Stephen Neill, The Unfinished Task, Lond. Lutterworth, 1957, p. 152; quoted in E. S. Fife and A. F. Glasser, Mission in Crisis, Chicago, Inter-Varsity Press, 1961 p. 120).

But I am not ready to write off Rome as total loss.

그러나 저는 Jerusalem 대회의 신학을 전적인 손실로 생각해 보려는 것은 아닙니다. 오늘날의 ^{experience} 선교신학은 Edinburgh 회의 뿐만 아니라 Jerusalem 대회에도 그 ^{root} 근거를 두어야 ^{have} 한다고 ^{great} 확신합니다. 오늘날의 ^{truth} 선교신학은 Edinburgh 회의의 ^{depth} 위대한 복음주의적 진실의 ^{on the other hand} 결실을 가져야 하며, ^{sheeping} 또 한편으로는 Jerusalem 대회에서 나타난 ^{human compassion} 맹렬한 인류애와 관심의 ^{attend} 넓이도 필요로 합니다. Edinburgh 회의와, Jerusalem 대회가 참가한 ^{abandon} 한류대모들의 ^{abandon} 주장은 모두 옳았습니다. 이 세계가 하나님의 ^{abandon} 구원이라는 기쁜 소식을 필요로 한다는 제 선친의 주장도 틀린 것은 아니었습니다. 그리고 한류의

농민들이 상당한 생활을 리도록 도와주어야 한다고 주장한 Hugh Cynn의 말도 역시 옳은 것이었습니다.

The Jerusalem statement: "Our fathers were impressed with horror
Jerusalem 대회에서는 다음과 같이 선언하셨습니다
"우리의 선조들은 인류가 그리스도 없이 죽어야 한다는 공포의 전율에 깊이 감동되었다 우리에게도 공포의 전율은 있다. 그러나 우리가 감동을 받게 된 공포의 전율은 인류가 그리스도 없이 살아야 한다는 것이다" 완전한 선교신학은 이러한 균형을 유지하여야 합니다. 천국생활에 사로잡혀 이 지구상의 인간생활을 무시하는 신학은 불충분한 것입니다. 말씀의 증거가 봉사와 분리될 수는 없습니다. 선도와 선행은 병존하는 것입니다. 만일 여러분의 선교신학은 단순한 복음전도이고, 제 선교신학은 단순히 선한 일을 도모하거나 공의를 이루는 일이라면 우리는 모두 잘못된 것입니다. 예수께서는 두가지를 다 하셨습니다. 마가는 예수께서 "오셔서 하나님의 복음을 전파하셨다" (마가 1:14)고 하였고, 누가는 "저가 두루 다니시며 착한 일을 행하셨다"고 (사도 10:38) 기록하셨습니다. 성서에서는 이 두가지를 모두 강조하고 있습니다.

4 church's Theol. y minis 만일 기독교의 선교신학이 세계인류의 3분의 2에 달하는 기아와 빈곤과 사회정의에 대하여 아무 말도 않거나 세계인류의 절실한 요구에 대하여 아무런 관계가 없다면 그러한 신학은 우리에게 덕을 먹이신 예수 그리스도의 신학은 되지 못합니다. 기독교가 "우리의 선교는 말씀을 증거하는 것이기

Copy 5/24

먹을 것을 주는 것은 아니다"라고 말할 때는 이미
 지났습니다. ^{answer} Nicholas Berdyaev는 다음과 같이
 말함으로써 이 문제에 관한 해답을 모든 교회에게
 주고 있습니다. 즉 "나 자신을 위한 음식은 육적인
 문제이다. 그러나 내 이웃과 다른 사람을 위한
 음식은 영적인 문제이다"

오늘날의 선교신학은 복음주의적이고 ^{doctrinal} 이론적인 것
^{more than} 이상을 요구할 것입니다. 오늘날의 선교신학은 사회적인
^{passion} 열정과 관심을 필요로 할 것입니다